

Eleven-Sixty=Five

The best comes pretty near being sold as cheap as the other kind here.

Public Library 4907

Men's finest \$15 and \$18 Suits, of the "right now" style and fit and fabric

\$11.65

This is getting the finest at working-clothes prices.

The Men

MURPHY, HIBBEN & CO.

(Wholesale Exclusively.)

The Demand of the Hour

- Is for Ladies' Collars and Cuffs.
- Ladies' Kids Belts in white and colors.
- Ladies' Patent Leather Belts.
- Ladies' Shirt Waists sets in Pearl and "Dumb Bell" patterns.
- Ladies' "stock" bows, black and all colors.

These, as well as all the novelties of the day, in stock ready for immediate shipment. Mail orders solicited.

FRANK H. CARTER, DRUGGIST.

300 Massachusetts Avenue.

When you select your doctor first, and then your druggist. We are in the drug business.

Big Four Route

EXCURSION

TO...

CINCINNATI

SUNDAY, MAY 24,

ONLY

\$1.50 FOR THE ROUND TRIP \$1.50

Tickets good only on special train leaving Indianapolis Union Station 7:30 a. m. and returning leave Cincinnati 7:30 p. m. same day.

Attractions at Cincinnati that Day

Base Ball at the League Park,

Louisville vs. Cincinnati;

Zoological Garden,

Ludlow Lagoon,

Concert by Belsted's Band

at Chester Park.

For tickets and full information call at Big Four ticket office, 22 N. 2nd St., Indianapolis, or at Union Station, 36 Jackson place and Union Station.

H. M. BRONSON, A. G. P. A.

C. H. & D. RY.

BEST LINE TO

Cincinnati,

DAYTON, TOLEDO AND DETROIT.

LEAVE INDIANAPOLIS.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

Cincinnati, Toledo, Dayton, Detroit, etc., daily, 7:30 a. m. and 7:30 p. m.

Press, except Sunday, 10:15 a. m. and 10:15 p. m.

SHIPPEE TO THE HIDE

"PARSON" GOODWIN CRITICISES MINISTERS IN CONFERENCE.

Untenable Position of Those Now Fighting Against the System of Preacher Transfers.

FUN WITH PROHIBITIONISTS

HOW THE STUMP SPEECH WAS CUT OUT OF THE DISCIPLINE.

Candidates for Bishop Put in Some Hard Licks Sunday Pulling Wires for Election.

Special to the Indianapolis Journal.

CLEVELAND, O., May 17.—The ever-bubbling-up liquor question came to the front yesterday through a resolution offered by a delegate from Kansas asking Congress to cease to grant permits to persons to sell intoxicating liquors in States where such sales are prohibited by constitution or law. It is strange that so intelligent a body as the General Conference could be induced to pass such a resolution in the face of the fact that the national government never grants a permit to sell intoxicants in any State whatever. No man can sell liquor by virtue of the government tax, though no man can sell without it, but in all cases the law of the State must be observed. The enforcement of the local laws depends on the local authorities and a so-called license from the government furnishes not a shadow of permit where it is unlawful to sell liquor. The permit to sell liquor is a matter of local law, and the only State that permits the sale of intoxicants under more or less restrictions and the government taxes all sellers, whether saloon keepers or druggists, not in order to give authority, but to collect revenue; and yet in the face of this the General Conference has passed a resolution to induce Congress to do it. It is such wild movements as this that impede the suppression of the saloon.

The question concerning baptism came up Saturday again on a motion to strike out the footnote in the Discipline which practically forbids the baptism of those who have been baptized in infancy. The question had been so thoroughly discussed on its first introduction that it passed with little opposition, so Methodism returns to its old-time rule and custom and those who were baptized in infancy may be rebaptized at their own request as was the early custom of the church.

The committee on itinerancy is wrestling with one of the knottiest questions in Methodism. It relates to the matter of transfers. It was early committed to a subcommittee that only submitted a report to the effect that no person should be transferred from one church to another without the consent of a majority of the presiding elders of that conference. The discussion of this report had a richness to those who understood the true inwardness of the case, something an uninitiated stranger could not realize. It was evident at first sight that it was deemed desirable to cut some restrictions on the bishop in the matter of transfers, but the reasons therefor were very much tinged with the personal environments of the speaker. For instance, one brother who had in early life floated from conference to conference, filling the pulpits in succession, and then being floated into a Chicago pulpit, and thence into the presiding eldership, wants no more transfers without the consent of the presiding elders of the conference into which the candidate for transfer was to land. Had he seen the danger of such transfers? Another member had long believed that he and others like him were being transferred for any purpose but the good of the church, and he wanted the home talent to take what was left. He wanted this growing custom of laymen restricted. Had he felt its wrong?

MINISTERS FLOATED. Another who had floated from conference to conference until he floated into a first-class university thought this right of the bishop essential to the genius of Methodism, and still another objected because it furnished a too convenient method for the bishops to shove into a new conference a class of unprepared men, and then to proceed to float them to other conferences, whom they cannot find places for when they are known. But behind all this is the genius of Methodism whose central thought is its non-attachment to any one place, and its non-attachment to any one person. It is a religion of the transient, and its members are merely a convenience, not a relation that gives no vested rights inclusive or exclusive.

One part of the discussion emphasized a feature of the itinerancy which is growing more and more embarrassing every year. Men were taken into the traveling connection—ten, fifteen or twenty or more years ago—who were not of the traveling connection. But they have not grown. They have hardly kept pace with the pew. They were borne with patiently. These are now members of the conference and the theory is that they should be placed in the traveling connection. Because there are so many of these, "up-to-date" churches ask for transfers. The contenders hold there is no room for transfers into a conference unless you transfer as many out. In other words: We must find room for the present membership of the conference, and for the present membership of the traveling connection. These are the two things to be considered. What to do with these "wet logs," as they are called in Methodist parlance, to make room for live men, is the perplexing problem which lies behind the discussion of the committee.

As the committee felt it involved no must I, for I am not in that business now. If I were, I would soon clear the deck and make room for live men if I had to transfer them across the continent, albeit some churches sometimes get badly "solid" in taking transfers. The time has come when Methodist congregations claim a right to have something to say as to their pastors, and to plead that the conference is too full to allow a transfer to come in is not conclusive against the system of transfers, which is intended to bring in new blood. It was once the boast of Methodism that every pastor had a flock and every flock a shepherd, but the converse of that is not true now. If it ever was—that every pastor must shepherd the flock arbitrarily assigned him and every flock must accept any pastor that is sent. All these considerations came up in the discussions of the committee. No wonder the whole subject was recommended to the subcommittee to eliminate these difficulties. But can it? We shall see.

The activity of the lay members of the General Conference in securing a better recognition of the laity is supplemented by many letters from laymen at home. Not a few are now here and more are coming to see what their personal presence can do. It is not improbable that provision will be made before the adjournment for a national laymen's convention in the near future. Suggestions on this subject by letter to the layman who represent the conference would, no doubt, be gladly received.

The address of ex-Governor McKinley last night on Washington was beautiful and able and the Army was packed to its utmost. I do not think it made a single one of us here, but it made those who made up their minds to vote for him under certain contingencies feel that they are not ashamed of their man. The only man that I heard growl was a man who can see nothing but Prohibition, or rather the need of it, in this world of ours.

The sermon of the national delegate from the British Conference was an elegant one, to use a young girl's expression, every way; full of pathos and spirituality and sound doctrine. What was quite as much to be commended, it was, like the sermon of his Irish colleague last Sunday, delivered in as good English as we could hear anywhere. LEONARD'S STUMP SPEECH.

The forthcoming report from the temperance committee has an inside history worth telling. The committee consists of 12, but seldom more than forty to fifty are in attendance. Early in the session a subcommittee of nine was appointed to draft the declaration of principles. It was easy to make the majority of this subcommittee consist of that class which had interjected a stump speech into the report of 1884. Many recall that it was convenient that year for Dr. Leonard, then Prohibition candidate for the office of Ohio, to read his prepared speech and say "Every Methodist must leave the Republican party or the church."

This speech has been repeated in all its moods and tenes by every Prohibition stump speaker of the land. At that time the report was galloped through that General Conference under the lash of the president's question and has adroitly been kept in the Discipline ever since. The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that "we must take no step backward," and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen. These had resolved to stand by a declaration of principle to be put into the Discipline as that of 1884, which held that no man should vote with a party that did not make prohibition a plank in its platform. The result of the caucus was a modification of the report, leaving out all that refers to party politics and the loop hole which was changed to read: "The majority of this subcommittee determined to retain it in the Discipline of 1886 under the specious plea that 'we must take no step backward,' and their report was adopted in the general committee, at which only thirty or forty were present, by a vote of 20 to 11. At this the minority gave notice that there would be a minority report thus precipitating a discussion in the General Conference. The minority report was prepared and soon had more names signed than voted for the majority report. This was more than the majority could stand, and the report was caucused to prevent it, seeing the minority contained such men as Rev. H. K. Carroll, editor of the New York Independent, a lay representative, and President Harris, of the Maine State University, another layman, and many others, ministers and laymen.